

Meeting Minutes

CCN 061746

Job No. 22192

Written Response Required? NO

Due Date: N/A

Actionee: N/A

Closes CCN: N/A

OU: GW/VZ100

TSD: N/A

ERA: N/A

Subject Code: 4170; 8830/4170

SUBJECT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT WEEKLY MEETING - AUGUST 31, 1998

TO Distribution

FROM Michael J. Graham, GW/VZ Project Manager

DATE September 2, 1998

ATTENDEES

See Attached Distribution List

DISTRIBUTION

Attendees

See Attached Distribution List

Document and Info Services H0-09

NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT WEEKLY MEETING:

REMINDER -- THERE WILL NOT BE A WEEKLY MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 7, 1998 DUE TO THE LABOR DAY HOLIDAY

Date: September 14, 1998

Location: PNNL Environmental Technology Building - Columbia River Room

Local Call In Number: (509) 376-7411

Toll Free Call In Number: (800) 664-0771

MEETING MINUTES:

A Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Weekly Meeting was held on August 31, 1998, in Richland, Washington, at PNNL's Environmental Technology Building - Columbia River Room.

PROJECT REPORT:

TWRS OPERATOR TRAINING SESSIONS: This week we completed TWRS Operator Training GW/VZ Project Information Sessions. The sessions provided background on the GW/VZ Project and what they can do to minimize impact to the groundwater system here at Hanford. Dru Butler and Bob Peterson were the presenters. The sessions were well received.

DWP FY99-01 FUNDING REVIEW: The Project had a session last Thursday with the regulators on the funding issues as part of the ER Contractor process. This meeting was to lock down the scope for FY99, which for us is the \$2M committed through the ER Project. Rich is continuing to lead the charge to identify other funding sources at Hanford.

QUESTION: What sort of response was received from the regulators?

8-31-98.WPD

ANSWER: Ecology was very strong in saying that we need to show a commitment to the Project by finding additional money. They suggested taking the \$2M approved for FY99 and burn it as if we would be getting the rest of the money. Tom Woods had comments stating a failure to see why the rest of the projects are not contributing to integration like the ER Project. The CRCIA and the Tribes are not close to conceding that the scope of this Project is \$2M. The game that is being played by the other projects is unacceptable.

We have had good discussions around the level of funding for this Project and the critical things commissioned to do at Hanford and the projects ability to integrate and influence priorities of the core projects. We are not sure if anyone is avoiding the issue, we still need to make a proposal.

QUESTION: Did the discussions get into what is being done in the other projects, such as bore holes in TWRS and other assessment work applicable to this Project? Did you get to the point where you could get specifics of what needs to be done?

ANSWER: The specifics we have from PNNL are pretty good. We do not have that level of detail from the TWRS Project yet, although Janice is just getting the scope statements now. We are putting a request in to see that level of detail before the fiscal year end so we can determine what exactly is in the projects. We have lump dollars sums that we can look at, but we don't know what is in the lump sums.

QUESTION: So we are not sure what is in TWRS and they don't have the level of detail of what they will be doing as is in the ER Project?

ANSWER: We have been told that Advanced Word Authorization is what TWRS will issue. We aren't sure what these will look like since they are something new. It will probably be at too high a level to discern anything. We will continue to ask for as much detail as we can get from TWRS.

Right now what we see is political maneuvering from the projects and their unwillingness to give up control of activities that should be integrated in this project. When that is sorted out, the funding issues will be resolved.

COMMENT: Surely John Wagoner and Lloyd Piper will deal with these issues when they are made clear to them?

RESPONSE: We can say that there is agreement in RL that this project will have concurrence on project plans. As far as the turf battles spoken of, if they are withholding information we would like to know that, and we haven't seen that to date.

COMMENT: What is happening at the next level up? Surely someone at the next level has jurisdiction over all these projects and they are aware of the needs.

RESPONSE: The group above is the Site Management Board and we have not made a specific proposal to them. All they have right now is last spring's integration priority list.

COMMENT: That sounds like a strange relationship -- Until the projects hear from the next level up they will not be concerned with what this project needs.

RESPONSE: We need to know if the projects are lined up before we go forward.

QUESTION: The proposal should go upward and then over to the projects. Their awareness is a courtesy. The action will only come if you convince the people above of your needs.

RESPONSE: RL doesn't totally agree. If you can get the projects in agreement then we are in a more powerful position. The other step we need to take is to get in line with the regulators. We have about one more week that we can wait to reach agreement with the regulators.

COMMENT: I agree with Mary and Gordon, it sounds like what you have is anarchy. You don't have management doing any managing.

RESPONSE: I don't understand how you get that.

COMMENT: If you have management, you hear from them what is important and direction is given to go and accomplish that which is important. This project isn't receiving that.

RESPONSE: Before we go to management we need to line-up with the regulators. We want to do that before the end of the week.

COMMENT: The problem is still not having enough money. We need to get more money. If the Site Management Board doesn't know anything of this project's needs at this stage in the process it is getting too late.

RESPONSE: Do you want RL to go forward with a proposal without your input?

COMMENT: What I hear is a willful intent to avoid taking action. You have the CRCIA recommendation and the SX Tank Farm recommendation, none of that is new. Having just looked at the specifics, the numbers sound right, but we should have been at this point several weeks ago and the whole program should have had site visibility months ago.

RESPONSE: We have said all along that we are not going to have an impact on the FY99 budget. We have all had an opportunity to comment on the path forward. We are going to ask for additional money. What we would like to have is an integrated approach to this before going forward. The clock is ticking, we have been trying to set-up a meeting with Ecology and haven't yet heard from them.

COMMENT: I find it difficult to understand that you don't know the position of all the agencies at this stage.

RESPONSE: We have put out a piece of paper and made a recommendation, to date I haven't heard from Ecology. We need to meet with the regulators before going forward.

COMMENT: Ecology can't meet today, the people from TWRS are not available. Ecology's management is aware that we need to close. I talked with Steve Alexander and Ecology's position is what we have already said, do CRCIA and get the funding necessary to make this happen. If we have confused you and that is not understood, we will have to put it in writing.

COMMENT: "Do CRCIA" is about as specific as "Have Peace on Earth." Saying "Do CRCIA" just doesn't give enough information, that is a long way from the next step.

COMMENT: This is a project with a lot of energy. With a budget of \$2M it won't give us anything. We are objecting to that kind of funding. When we have a \$2M placeholder you can't say that you can make this integration happen. You can't fund the expert panel. \$2M is unacceptable.

RESPONSE: Once again, we have not yet made a proposal. No one has turned us down for a request for more funds. What we do have is a \$2M placeholder and we need to go forward with a proposal request for additional funds.

COMMENT: DOE needs to go forward and ask for more money and there hasn't been any asking yet. That is unacceptable.

RESPONSE: I can't just say, "Give me X." I first need to define what "X" is and what is in "X." I need a position from Ecology on what needs to go forward, from the entire department. I need to know what it is we are asking more money for. Help me define what "X" is in three increments, if we have an additional \$5M, here is what we will ask for, and with another \$5M we will ask for this.

COMMENT: That approach has not been successful in the past.

COMMENT: What I am hearing is that you are offering us a new opportunity, we can agree to disagree.

COMMENT: I am not as expert as many in this room, but I do have some experience and what I see is missing is that the suggestion to do CRCIA is too broad. The thing that is wrong with that statement is it doesn't have enough specifics. What you need from the analysis is guidance on the priority of various remediation activities and I can't believe that you can find anything more important than TWRS and Spent Nuclear Fuel. Both have environmental impacts that are far less than satisfactory. Unless we can get the technical data that will take years, I'm wondering why we need CRCIA.

COMMENT: What I understand is that this discussion is two pronged. First, to make final decisions, we have to do the kind of assessment that is identified in CRCIA, and second, we also have important activities that need to go forward (i.e., begin the process of vitrification and sluicing tanks) before the CRCIA is complete. We have to prioritize what data we need and determine to go and get it. CRCIA is a longer term decision process, the second is a near term decision and they need to be married together. Everything is so fragmented that things are being done that we know shouldn't be done.

COMMENT: Fundamentally, the only thing that is possible to do is some vadose zone characterization and assessment, and maybe continue at a modest level the analytical model and conceptual model development, but they will lag behind the effort to get physical problems out of the ground.

COMMENT: Some of that is underway and planned such as 200 Area Assessment and Tank Farm boreholes.

COMMENT: TWRS hasn't integrated. Last week they were told to drill new groundwater holes around the Tank Farms. TWRS went to a IAMIT meeting and said that they would handle that activity and

take care of the money to bore those holes. That activity has been thrown off below the line because this project isn't in control and because the other projects are out of control. That is what this integration project needs to work. Ecology will make that position clear in writing.

RESPONSE: I am in agreement on most of what has been said. The first step is to have a proposal on the street that we can all agree with.

It is good that there is still this much energy and enthusiasm for what we are doing. I think the message we are hearing is, "Get on with it!" We have done our best to listen to the recommendations and inputs and now we need to get on with the show.

COMMENT: If their responsibility is to make sure we meet TPA agreements, then we have to have control. Conflicting requirements have to meet somewhere and the System Assessment is the key. However, recognize that there are people who want to move dirt, or pump and treat, or drill holes, and modeling is low on their priorities.

RESPONSE: What is key is how you do those things in step so you are being smart as you move ahead. Rich Holten needs input on prioritizing the important elements that we need to move forward so that he can say to the Site Management Board that he has agreement.

COMMENT: This is the end of August 1998 and at the end of July 1997, in a specially convened meeting of all the executives in the Hanford cleanup process, all three Tribes, EPA, Ecology, and State of Oregon were in attendance. The meeting was held in Salt Lake City and was to identify what was and was not going to be done in 1998 because there wasn't enough money to do what was baselined to be done. For two and one-half days we listened to discussions on efficiencies and scope cutting to close the gap on available funding. Of all the initiatives on the table that were discussed, it was unanimously decided that we had to fund the CRCIA. DOE to this day has not responded to that demand, and to this day has continued to stonewall. You do not need hand holding to go after funding and support the CRCIA unless it is something you don't want to do. There has been ample backing and ample demand.

RESPONSE: We have gone through this before. I have talked with other people who attended that meeting and they did not come away from it with the same perspective that Tom has just said. The concept was discussed, specifics were not. What I have heard was that there was a general agreement that it was a good approach.

COMMENT: EPA was a little on the fence at that time, but they did say that this assessment needs to be done.

RESPONSE: We all say something like CRCIA needs to go forward. The questions are how soon and how fast?

COMMENT: They said to do it and nothing has been done to date.

QUESTION: Can you honestly say that in the past year what we have done represents a fast track, push forward to do something?

ANSWER: We are following the Plan for the Plan that was published in April. We have been running along the plan and have spent the summer listening and bringing in the National Labs, and at the end of the calendar year we will put out a Long-Range Plan. That is the path we are moving down.

Also, we have a lot of issues in regards to this project and we need to catch up with what DOE-HQ is doing as well.

NATIONAL LABS/S&T: These major group activities were planned for this fiscal year and were completed last week. The five task leads have been given specific writing assignments and will provide them to Shirley Rawson by September 15. Shirley will then review and then at the end of the month we will have a "roll up your sleeves" meeting in San Francisco to come to terms with any differences. Also, the plan is to have the draft roadmaps wrapped up late this year.

EXPERT PANEL: We have been in contract negotiations with most of the members of the panel. A couple have been unavailable due to travel and vacations, but we should have things complete by the end of this week. The plan is to have our kickoff meeting with the panel on September 15-17. Dr. Edgar Berkey has agreed to act as interim chairman. We sent him a packet of information as background (Information List Attached). We have setup a database that will track information given to the panel so that we can keep a record of when and what we are sending. We are looking for opportunities for the panel to meet the public. Our initial thinking is to have a social event with a less formal setting. We will be working the agenda for these meetings this week and hope to attach it to the meeting minutes. Please provide any input on the agenda to Bob Peterson (509-372-9638) who is the liaison for the Expert Panel (Agenda Attached).

QUESTION: What are you expecting to accomplish at this first meeting?

ANSWER: We want to get them up to speed on the issues here at Hanford. They need to work out how they will work as a group and what level they will operate at, as well as get to know the players. Berkey has run several committees in the past and has a good perspective.

QUESTION: This will be an enormous information activity. Someone will need to set priorities or they won't be able to even get started. What questions are going to be thrown at them in this first meeting?

ANSWER: I don't know if we are going to give them any questions at this first meeting. We can't provide the specifics right now, but you have raised some good points.

QUESTION: Are we asking them to review and provide input?

ANSWER: Not at this first meeting. I'm sure they will provide their opinions, but at this first meeting they will be trying to figure out how best to operate as a panel, determine what level of information they need, and at what level they will operate.

QUESTION: Will this panel have a mission statement you will suggest, or will they develop their own? They need to know why they are here, are you ready to tell them?

ANSWER: Clearly we are at a critical position at this time. The contracts for the panel are for this first meeting with an option to extend if funding is available in FY99. You can't have an Expert Panel with a \$2M scope.

QUESTION: Are you looking for feedback on the documents that were sent to Dr. Berkey? In looking at the list, I can see that there are documents that might be of equal importance that they haven't seen yet.

ANSWER: This was just a first grab to try and give Dr. Berkey some information before he went on vacation. If you have other documents that should be shared with the panel, please let Michael Graham (509-372-9179) or Bob Peterson (509-372-9638) know.

QUESTION: When looking at the budget document that was attached to last week's meeting minutes, are we looking at specific budget requirements as a whole site? What kind of input are you trying to get from the stakeholders and regulators?

ANSWER: We are looking at everything related to the vadose zone and groundwater.

COMMENT: We already put out a list of some of the activities that we would like to have undertaken that comes to \$11.8M.

RESPONSE: We have talked about that amount and asked about doing only two tank farms and then doing a clean site (large scale field test). We have proposed an east and west Tank Farm. Before spending additional money on Tank Farms we need to see if they can successfully spend that money.

COMMENT: They can spend it, but I'm not sure it would be successfully.

COMMENT: Please discuss alternate ideas with the contractor staff. We have received guidance from Wagoner to use the vadose zone program plan.

RESPONSE: Before spending \$11.8M we suggest doing some other things first. Given what we have heard from the National Labs, we need to do peer reviews, roadmaps, System Assessment Capability, and Conceptual Model verification. We need to dialog those activities and see whether or not you still believe that the what is on \$11.8M is still the top priority.

COMMENT: TWRS is only one component of the system. Suppose Bruce Napier has \$12.8M and Fish and Wildlife has another amount, someone needs to integrate and sort all the pieces if we aren't going to get all the money that everyone requests.

COMMENT: It sounds to me like what you are saying is that all the work that ER is proposing is more important than any of the work proposed by other people, including the Yakamas and Ecology.

RESPONSE: I'm not sure what you are saying. The guidance that we are speaking of came from Jackson.

COMMENT: You said last week that this was the ER Integration Project.

RESPONSE: This is a strawman. We are asking that you think about the situation on the site. We cannot make good decisions without tools in place to make those decisions. Otherwise, you have a bunch of stuff that is almost impossible to prioritize. What the CRCIA calls for is tools that will allow you to identify what your contributors are.

COMMENT: Let me reiterate again what the Yakama's would recommend. There is a set of core activities for this project and we would hope that the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Project would be renamed so that they and the CRCIA can become one and the same. Don't make any effort to separate them. We see a set of core activities necessary to reach a point for the entire site where we can understand the relative contributions to hazard from all contributions out through time, and provide whatever it needs to get that understanding regarding the core activities, including whatever block of money it takes.

In regards to the core activities, it seems reasonable to get an answer that everyone can stand behind for a three year period. As best as we can sort out, the three year effort is between \$25M-\$30M. I don't know what the profile is. It shouldn't be up to the stakeholders to define what needs to be done to achieve that goal. The labs may do part, but it needs to be an integrated analysis and it needs to be done in three years. The funding surrounding the core activities from the various projects is already on the books. There is a great deal of field data and so on that, if the peripheral activities were well integrated, would support the activities. To date we haven't any knowledge that allows us to determine if it is a duplicate activity or if it is inconsistent. We must be integrated to allow us to make adjustments as required. If this project can't integrate, then it is just more spin doctoring. The Yakama's recommend that there is a \$30M peripheral budget, plus the core budget, and that is their rock bottom position.

Since we find it hard to find any rational basis to make key decisions on site that will probably have long-term effects (i.e. sluicing and removing tank waste), it is one thing to proceed in parallel while the engineering is continuing based on sluicing, and that activities proceed with no underpinning beneath the activities; and another to proceed to reduce risk. But to defend, ignore and stonewall core activities and continue engineering based on sluicing and on defenseless activities is an abomination, and the site should be taken to task if that funding goes on that way.

COMMENT: The one year effort for assessment will be an easy extension of the composite analysis, you have a lot of the worst actors. If that has been done, then a few man years gets you to your one year estimate, then you determine if there is any need for secondaries. If the primaries are high, then you need to search for more.

QUESTION: I would only add that we are confused. We thought we had been clear that the SAC needs to go forward as a priority and we have not seen that commitment to that. Why is that message not clear and how can it be obscure? We haven't had a meeting that we haven't expressed that concern. The question then follows, what is the difference between hearing and listening? How well is DOE listening is a question we have to ask? We have said that we may not be in agreement, but are we being heard and talking on the same issues?

ANSWER: DOE is frustrated too. I believe that we are showing the best commitment. What we are showing here is the first increment (assuming \$30M is okay) which has \$1M for a System Assessment Capability, that is what we are recommending. If it should be more, should we delete peer reviews if the whole \$5M should be SAC?

COMMENT: What the rest of the stakeholders are expecting is a spokesman for DOE.

RESPONSE: The only spokesman for Hanford is Wagoner and he needs to hear from me. If I go forward today, in the first \$5M it would have \$1M for SAC with another run in about a year.

COMMENT: What I am hearing is that \$1M doesn't cut it. It will take \$8M for the first year. You need to go and ask for the \$11.8M. We don't agree that we have to go through increments because that is the way the game is played.

RESPONSE: But you have to be able to say what you get for the \$8M.

COMMENT: It is out of order for us to plan the assessment. Only the contractor can plan the assessment.

RESPONSE: One of the things to make sure that we lay out on paper is our architecture. There are a lot of activities to implement the SAC.

COMMENT: Going through some items on the list, there may already be a lot of what we are concerned about on the budget, but it is not clear and identifiable. Segregate out those things that are SAC related. That may be part of the problem.

RESPONSE: That is being worked as we talk. We need the engagement of the National Labs.

If we are in agreement on the dollars, we can rewrite the scope. We don't have a lot of the details laid out. Below increment A there isn't any detail, just suggestions of areas.

COMMENT: Ecology will tell you that we need \$26M. This meeting signifies that the wheels have fallen off the cart as far as a site-wide integration program. Ecology believes that you need to fund this work and it hasn't been funded. This document clearly shows a lack of interest to fund.

RESPONSE: Why does it show a lack of interest? We will put on the list everything that you give us. What we need is Ecology to join in prioritization of the list.

COMMENT: It is almost too late for that. We are at the end of the ball game and you don't have enough pitchers left in the game. Ecology will put it down in writing and then you can talk to Mike Wilson about it.

COMMENT: What is disturbing is that after all this time action depends on yet another letter.

COMMENT: I understand, but that is how the game is being played.

COMMENT: What data we have is garbage. It won't be easy to get good data and we don't hear anything about it. We only seem to focus on the middle of the system where our knowledge is pretty good. I don't hear about the beginning and the end of the system. Let's talk about impacts.

COMMENT: Ecology has sent corrective action letters that made clear their position on TWRS and its minimum funding for 1999. It is show time, and the time for talking is over. You have been given an outline and if you don't come up with the money, then we will be talking across a courtroom.

QUESTION: Shouldn't there be other organizations laying out their suggestions in parallel before any decisions are made?

COMMENT: Integration was tasked to do just that, but in the last six months you have been meeting you haven't done much. You need to do the investigation and assessment. You have known that for a long time.

COMMENT: That is pretty harsh. There is an enormous total picture and I am sympathetic to the magnitude of the problem. You need to recognize that there are others giving recommendations of what needs attention. I see in the Project Specification that the pieces of the system are recognized. There is gratification in seeing that they are there.

QUESTION: Rich, are you clear on what actions items you need to do?

ANSWER: I need to go to the Site Management Board with several different paths. I will also be calling to request a meeting with the regulators.

UPCOMING EVENTS:

Next Monday is a Holiday. We will pick back up on Monday, September 14. The Expert Panel Kickoff Meetings will be September 15-17, details are on the attached agenda. Stakeholder, Tribal Nations and regulators are invited to attend and participate.

NOTE:

Groundwater/Vadose Zone Web Site Location: <http://www.bhi-erc.com/vadose>

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1) Tentative Agenda for the Expert Panel Kickoff Meeting - September 15-17, 1998
- 2) Information List Transmitted to Dr. Edgar Berkey
- 3) 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar

ATTENDEES:

Martin Bensky, HAB
Bob Bryce, PNNL
Dirk Dunning, Oregon
Bryan Foley, DOE-RL
Michael Graham, BHI
Doug Hildebrand, DOE-RL
Dave Holland, Ecology
Rich Holten, DOE-RL
Stan Leja, Ecology
Fred Mann, FDNW
Katy McKeig, SMS, Inc.
Tom Page, PNNL

Tom Post, EPA
Gordon Rogers, HAB
Casey Ruud, Ecology
Karen Strickland, BHI
Janice Williams, FDH
Thomas W. Woods, YIN

ATTACHMENT 1
TENTATIVE AGENDA
GROUNDWATER VADOSE ZONE EXPERT PANEL:
FIRST MEETING, SEPTEMBER 15-17, 1998

Tuesday, September 15PNNL – EMSL Assembly Room

Coffee	7:30 am	00:30
Welcome and Introductions [<i>Holten</i>]	8:00 am	00:30
Expert Panel Members		
Integration Project Staff		
GW/VZ Integration Project [<i>Holten, Graham</i>]	8:30 am	00:30
Why Does the Project Exist?		
What is the Project Mission?		
Expert Panel's Role in the Project		
Integration Project Path Forward [<i>Graham</i>]	9:00 am	00:30
[Break]	9:30 am	00:15
Integration Project: Core Projects [<i>Wintczak</i>]	9:45 pm	02:00
[Eleven core projects--scope, plans, issues]		
[Lunch – Purchase Own/Brown Bag]	11:45 pm	01:15
Science and Technology Road Maps [<i>Rawson</i>]	1:00 pm	01:00
[Break]	2:00 pm	00:15
Perspective from Stakeholders [<i>Butler</i>]	2:15 am	02:00
Tribal Nations		
Regulatory Agencies		
Public Interest Groups and Citizens		
Questions: Open Discussion	4:15 pm	00:30
Agenda for Wednesday	4:45 pm	00:15
[Reception - Tentative]	5:00 pm	[open]

Wednesday, September 16, Morning Session for Panel MembersBHI – 2D01 Conf. Room

Introduction to Hanford Site Tour [<i>Peterson</i>]	8:00 am	00:30
Hanford Site Tour for Panel Members [<i>Peterson</i>]	8:30 am	03:30
[Lunch – Purchase Own/Brown Bag]	12:00 pm	01:00

Wednesday, September 16, Afternoon SessionPNNL – EMSL Assembly Room

Challenges for the Expert Panel [<i>Holten, Ford</i>]	1:00 pm	01:00
Background: Previous Major Reviews [<i>Wintczak, Peterson</i>]		
Role of Subpanels		
Accommodating Other Expert Panels		
Questions: Open Discussion	2:00 pm	01:00
Work Session for Panel Members	3:00 pm	[as req'd]

Thursday, September 17, Morning SessionPNNL – EMSL Assembly Room

Work Session for Panel Members Continued		[as req'd]
Comments from the Panel [<i>Berkey</i>]	10:00 am	01:00
Closing Remarks from the Project [<i>Holten, Graham</i>]	11:00 am	01:00
Adjourn	12:00 noon	

**INFORMATION TRANSMITTED TO
DR. EDWARD BERKEY
AUGUST 28, 1998**

PRIORITY:

PROTOCOL FOR GW/VZ EXPERT PANEL

- ◆ **Draft Protocol for External Technical Review of the Hanford Groundwater/Vadose Zone Project (Version G – June 29, 1998)**

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- ◆ **A proposal to address the characterization of the Hanford Vadose Zone and protection of the Columbia River (January 10, 1998)**
- ◆ **Requirements for a Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment – Part II (Fall 1997)**
- ◆ **GAO Report to Congressional Requestors – Nuclear Waste, Understanding of Waste Migration at Hanford is Inadequate for Key Decisions (March 23, 1998)**
- Vadose Zone Expert Panel Meeting – Meeting Closeout Report (June 23-25, 1998)
- Executive Summary – Retrieval Performance Evaluation (RPE) (August 1998 Preliminary Draft)
- Tank Waste Remediation System Vadose Zone Program Plan (July 1998)
- TWRS Vadose Zone Conceptual Model and Assessment of Critical Data Gaps (August 1998)

LETTERS:

- SX Vadose Zone Expert Panel – Management and Integration of Hanford Site Groundwater and Vadose Zone Activities (March 18, 1998)
- Department of Ecology – Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project Stakeholder Meeting (April 16, 1998)
- Response to above Department of Ecology April 16, 1998 letter (June 2, 1998)
- Government Accountability Project – Hanford Vadose Zone (April 23, 1998)
- Response to above Governmental Accountability Project April 23, 1998 letter (May 15, 1998)
- State of Washington – Notice of Intent to Sue for Violations of the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (June 8, 1998)
- Heart of America Northwest – Continuing Lack of Public Involvement and Contract for Planning Public Involvement in the Critical Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project (July 9, 1998)
- Response to above Heart of America Northwest July 9, 1998 letter (August 6, 1998)
- Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Indian Nation – Suggested Reorientation of the Draft Tribal Government and Public Consultation Plan; Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project (August 20, 1998)
- Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment – CRCIA Team Comments re: Draft Tribal Government and Public Involvement Consultation Plan; Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project (August 21, 1998)
- Environmental Protection Agency – EPA Membership on the CRCIA Management Team (August 25, 1998)

6-WEEK LOOK AHEAD
AUGUST 31, 1998 - OCTOBER 15, 1998
GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT

<i>August 3 to September 4</i>	Review of the Draft Project Specification Document
<i>September 9</i>	Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Quarterly Public Involvement Meeting; 1-3 PM – Pendleton, OR – Doubletree Hotel, Cayuse Room, 304 SE Nye Avenue
<i>September 9-11</i>	Hanford Advisory Board Meetings – Pendleton, OR – Doubletree Hotel, Cayuse Room, 304 SE Nye Avenue
<i>September 9-10</i>	National Research Council Meeting – Washington, DC
<i>September 14</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL Columbia River Room
<i>September 15-17</i>	1998 Kickoff meeting with Expert Panel
<i>September 21</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL Columbia River Room
<i>September 21-22</i>	Owendoff Project Review
<i>September 24-25</i>	Nevada Vadose Zone Monitoring Workshop (Sponsored by DOE Nevada Operations) Las Vegas, NV
<i>September 28</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL Columbia River Room
<i>October 5</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL Columbia River Room
<i>October 12</i>	Weekly Project Status Meeting 1:00 p.m. - PNNL Columbia River Room

GW/VZ Integration Project Distribution List

Associated Western Universities, Inc.

Ruth Ann Kirk kirk_ra@awu.org

Bechtel Hanford, Inc.

D. H. Butler cc:Mail
 R. L. Dale cc:Mail
 P. G. Doctor cc:Mail
 S. C. Foelber cc:Mail
 B. H. Ford cc:Mail
 O. T. Goodman cc:Mail
 M. J. Graham cc:Mail
 M. C. Hughes cc:Mail
 R. Jundt cc:Mail
 A. J. Knepp cc:Mail
 B. S. Kuntz cc:Mail
 S. D. Liedle cc:Mail
 N. B. Myers cc:Mail
 K. H. Strickland cc:Mail
 T. M. Wintezak cc:Mail

Benton-Franklin Public Health

Margery Swint Fax: 375-5750

Bureau of Land Management

Jake Jakabosky jjakabos@sc0126wp.sc.blm.gov

Central WA Building Trades Council

Richard Berglund Fax: 547-2139

City of Pasco

Charles Kilbury Fax: 545-3403

City of Richland

Pam Brown Fax: 942-7379
 Jill Monley Fax: 942-7379

City of West Richland

Jerry Peltier cc:Mail

Columbia River United

Greg deBruler cruwa@gorge.net

CRESP

John Abbotts abbottsj@u.washington.edu
 Tim Ewers tewers@moscow.com
 D. Mercer dmercer@u.washington.edu

DOE-Headquarters

R. Alvarez robert.alvarez@hq.doe.gov
 J. D. Berwick jberwick@doegjpo.com
 H. W. Calley harry.calley@em.doe.gov
 M. K. Harmon cc:Mail
 W. M. Levitan william.levitan@em.doe.gov
 E. Livingston ellen.livingston@hq.doe.gov

DOE-RL

L. K. Bauer cc:Mail
 D. H. Chapin cc:Mail
 S. S. Clark cc:Mail
 K. V. Clarke cc:Mail
 B. L. Foley cc:Mail
 J. B. Hall cc:Mail
 J. P. Hanson cc:Mail
 R. D. Hildebrand cc:Mail
 R. A. Holten cc:Mail
 C. S. Louie cc:Mail
 G. M. McClure cc:Mail
 D. E. Olson cc:Mail
 M. J. Plahuta cc:Mail
 K. K. Randolph cc:Mail
 D. S. Shafer cc:Mail
 M. I. Talbot cc:Mail
 D. K. Tano cc:Mail
 K. M. Thompson cc:Mail
 A. C. Tortoso cc:Mail
 J. K. Yerxa cc:Mail
 J. H. Zeisloft cc:Mail

ECO Associate

J. S. Lewinsohn cc:Mail

EnviroIssues

Holly Delaney envissue@halcyon.com
 Louise Dressen envissue@halcyon.com
 Jennifer Kauffman envissue@halcyon.com

Environmental Management Advisory Board

J. T. Melillo james.melillo@em.doe.gov
 M. R. Pfister michael.pfister@hq.doe.gov

Framatome

Rex Robinson send hard copy

Freestone Environmental Sevices

Daniel K. Tyler cc:Mail

General Public

Marilyn Anderson marnhar@3-cities.com
 Dr. Rob Drury hermes@owt.com
 Chester Huang ulft77a@prodigy.com
 Glenn Russcher send hard copy

Government Accountability Project

Pamela Burton jjs1@jps.net
 Tom Carpenter gap@whistleblower.org

Government Accounting Office

Chris Abraham cc:Mail

Grant & Franklin Counties

Jack Yorgesen Fax: 1-509-932-4306

HAB's Hanford Work Force Nonunion/

Nonmanagement Employees

Madeleine Brown cc:Mail
 Jeff Luke cc:Mail
 Susan Leckband cc:Mail
 Wayne Martin cc:Mail

HAB's Public-at-Large

Martin Bensky send hard copy
 Gordon Rogers send hard copy

Hanford Action of Oregon

Robin Klein Fax: 1-503-736-0097

Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council

Jim Watts cc:Mail

Hanford Environmental Action League

Todd Martin Fax: 1-509-326-2932

Hanford Watch

Paige Knight Fax: 1-503-287-6329

Heart of America Northwest

Gerald Pollet Fax: 1-206-382-1148
 Page Leven Fax: 1-206-382-1148

ICF Kaiser Consulting Group

Barry Moravek BMoravek@icfkaiser.com

In Situ Technologies, Inc.

Randy Price r4mprice@3-cities.com

Jacobs Engineering

Lynne Roeder-Smith cc:Mail

JAI Corporation

Don Clark donclark@gte.net

KEPR Television

Peter Michaels Fax: 547-5365

Lower Columbia Basin Audobon Society

Rick Leaumont leaumont@owt.com

MacTec-ERS

Jim Bertsch Jill_M_Meinecke@rl.gov
 John Brodeur Jill_M_Meinecke@rl.gov

Numatec Hanford

Jerry Davis cc:Mail

Oregon Hanford Waste Board

Shelley Cimon Fax: 1-541-963-0853

Oregon Office of Energy

Mary Lou Blazek Fax: 1-503-373-7806
 Dirk Dunning dirk.a.dunning@state.or.us
 Mike Grainey Fax: 1-503-373-7806
 Doug Huston Fax: 1-503-373-7806
 Steve Sautter steven.p.sautter@state.or.us

Other Place Ranch

Louis Hamilton othrplcrh@aol.com

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

Marcel P. Bergeron cc:Mail
 Robert W. Bryce cc:Mail
 Charles T. Kincaid cc:Mail
 Phil E. Long cc:Mail
 Bruce A. Napier cc:Mail
 Thomas L. Page cc:Mail
 Marilyn J. Quadrel cc:Mail
 Shirley A. Rawson cc:Mail
 R. Jeff Serne cc:Mail
 Terri L. Stewart cc:Mail
 Barbara K. Wise cc:Mail

Pacific Rim Enterprise Center

Vince Panesko vince@owt.com

Port of Benton

Robert Larson Fax: 375-6008

Systematic Management Service, Inc.

Katy Makeig makeig@erols.com

Tri-Cities Visitor & Convention Bureau

Kris Watkins 783-9005

Tri-City Herald

John Stang Fax: 582-1510

Tri-Cities Development & Economic Council

Dick Greenberg Fax: 735-6609
 Harold Heacock Fax: 735-6609
 Sam Volpentest Fax: 735-6609

TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla

Indian Reservation

Stuart Harris Fax: 1-541-278-5380
 Armand Minthorn Fax: 1-541-278-5380
 Joe Richards Rjoey@ix.netcom.com
 J. R. Wilkinson jrww@ucinet.com

Nez Perce Tribe

Dan Landeen Fax: 1-208-843-7378
 Donna Powaukee Fax: 1-208-843-7378
 Stan Sobczyk stans@nezperce.org
 John Stanfill johns@nezperce.org

TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS (continued)

Wanapaum Tribe

Rex Buck rbuck@gcpud.org
Brent Lenz blenz@gcpud.org

Yakama Indian Nation

Barbara Harper bharper@nwinfo.net
Russell Jim Fax: 1-509-452-2503
Lino Niccoli Fax: 943-8555
Wade Riggsbee riggsbee@3-cities.com
Thomas W. Woods Fax: 943-8555

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Craig Cameron criag_e_cameron@rl.gov
Larry Gadbois cc:Mail
Dennis A. Faulk cc:Mail
Tom Post cc:Mail
Doug Sherwood cc:Mail

UC National Labs

Sandra Wagner swagner@lanl.gov

UFA Ventures, Inc., WSU Tri-Cities

Jim Conca Fax: 375-7451
Joseph Mockler Fax: 375-7451

University of Washington

Thomas Engel Fax: 1-206-685-8665

WA State Department of Ecology

Steve Alexander cc:Mail
Suzanne Dahl-Crumpler cc:Mail
Damon Delistraty ddel461@ecy.wa.gov
Jack W. Donnelly cc:Mail
Dib Goswami cc:Mail
Dave Holland cc:Mail
Stan Leja cc:Mail
Zelma Maine cc:Mail
Scott McKinney cc:Mail
Valarie Peery cc:Mail
Max Power cc:Mail
Casey Ruud cc:Mail
Ron Skinnarland cc:Mail
Phillip R. Staats cc:Mail
Geoff Tallent cc:Mail
Michael Turner cc:Mail
Mike Wilson cc:Mail

WA State Department of Fish and Wildlife

Jay McConnaughey Fax: 736-3030

WA State Department of Health

Nancy Darling ned0303@hub.doh.wa.gov
Debra McBaugh Fax: 1-360-236-2255

Washington League of Women Voters

Elizabeth Tabbutt Fax: 1-360-956-9287

Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility

Ruth Yarrow psrwase@igc.apc.org

Washington State University

James Cochran Fax: 372-7354

Waste Management Northwest

Don Moak cc:Mail